

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA  
Alexandria Division

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *et al.*, )  
  )  
Plaintiffs, )  
  )  
v. ) Civil Action No. 1:23cv0108 (LMB/JFA)  
  )  
GOOGLE LLC, )  
  )  
Defendant. )  
  )

---

**ORDER**

On July 9, 2025, plaintiffs filed a motion for leave to file under seal exhibits 1 and 2 and portions of their supplemental memorandum in support of their motion to compel production of defendant's remedy feasibility documents to the European Commission. (Docket no. 1536). In the memorandum in support of the motion to seal, plaintiffs state that the information sought to be sealed is based on defendant designating that information as confidential and that plaintiffs do not believe the information subject to this motion to seal is a type that outweighs the presumption in favor of access. (Docket no. 1537). Defendant has filed a response to the motion to seal. (Docket no. 1550). No other person or entity has filed a response or objection to this motion to seal.

Defendant's response seeks to have the redactions on page two and the redaction following the text "alongside Google's professed" on page three of plaintiffs' supplemental memorandum remain under seal. Defendant does not seek to have the redaction in section B on page 3 of the supplemental memorandum remain under seal. In addition, defendant requests that exhibit 1 to plaintiffs' supplemental memorandum remain under seal and that portions of exhibit 2 remain under seal. Defendant has filed in the public record a proposed redacted version of

exhibit 2. In the memorandum in support of the motion to seal, defendant states that the information it seeks to have remain under seal contains information protected by the attorney work product doctrine and information containing proprietary and commercially sensitive technical and business information and referencing highly sensitive settlement negotiations.

This motion to seal concerns materials submitted to the court for review on a motion to compel and therefore any information to be filed under seal must satisfy the “common law” standard discussed in *Va. Dep’t of State Police v. Wash. Post*, 386 F.3d 567, 575 (4th Cir. 2004). Having reviewed the information that defendant seeks to remain under seal, the court finds that for **the purposes of this motion**, that information may remain under seal at this time. For these reasons, it is hereby

ORDERED that the motion to seal is granted in part and denied in part. The court finds that the information that was redacted on pages 2 and the top of page 3 described above may remain under seal. Plaintiffs shall file in the public record a version of their supplemental memorandum that includes the information that had previously been redacted in section B on page 3. The court also finds that exhibits 1 and the unredacted version of exhibit 2 shall remain under seal.

Entered this 18th day of July, 2025.

Alexandria, Virginia

  
/s/  
John F. Anderson  
United States Magistrate Judge

John F. Anderson  
United States Magistrate Judge